DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 210 SP 035 639

AUTHOR Kershaw, Annie
TITLE Teachers Assessment of the Agenda and the Organization of Staff Development Programs as Suggested in Current Research.
PUB DATE [22 Jan 95]
NOTE 19p.; Some pages contain very small print.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Literature Reviews; *Participative Decision Making; Secondary School Teachers; *Staff Development; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

A review of research traces the history and development of staff development and inservice teacher education during the 20th century. Current research suggests that if teachers were to consider staff development as one of their most important responsibilities, they would have a profound influence on the direction their school would take in preparing for the challenges of the 21st century. This study of 36 Chicago (Illinois) public school teachers was undertaken, therefore, to determine their assessment of the agenda and organization of staff development programs as suggested in the current research. The survey addressed: topics, preplanning, planning, implementation, evaluation, and maintenance. Data showed that teachers felt that topics should include student discipline, parental participation, at-risk students, and classroom behavior management. In regard to preplanning/establishing a committee, 40 percent felt that their major concerns were not recognized. In regards to planning staff development, 63 percent felt that they had no input in planning staff development meetings. About half felt that goals and objectives had been written clearly and appropriate leaders selected, but that a system for evaluating the training had not been established. The majority felt that ample opportunities were provided for active involvement and practice of techniques, new techniques or skills were introduced, and participants had an opportunity to ask questions. Less than half reported that follow-up sessions within the school were held to discuss implementation of the techniques and that incentives were provided for employing new techniques. The paper concludes that teachers want to take a more active role in preplanning, planning, and implementing their own staff development programs, and that programming needs to be restructured to reflect this. (Contains 15 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 210

TEACHERS ASSESSMENT OF THE AGENDA AND THE ORGANIZATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AS SUGGESTED IN CURRENT RESEARCH

Annie Kershaw

According to Orlich (1989), the concept of in-service education developed over a century ago. Since the advent of public education in the United States, school administrators have seen the need for additional training for their staff. Many teachers in the mid-1800s were not prepared to be teachers, but were simply recruited for classroom service as greater numbers of children entered the schools. This condition resulted from a commitment to universal elementary education.

Much of the in-service training at the time consisted of short two-or-three-day institutes, evening work sessions, and various courses to remedy teacher deficiencies. Tyler (1971) observed that institutes were largely remedial and attempted to help teachers learn more practical ideas for classroom application.

Between the early 1900s and World War II, in-service programs for may teachers consisted of summer sessions at normal schools. This again was primarily to overcome grave deficiencies in teachers' entry preparation. As the commitment to universal education was implemented, states assumed regulation of teacher certification, and many teachers then had to complete a bachelor's degree. This led to college or university correspondence and extension courses designed to meet college degree requirements as well as, or in addition to, state certification. Early in-service education was not designed for individual teacher growth but as apparently based on external institutional or agency requirements developed by state departments of public instruction and colleges or universities.

Until the 1930s, in-service education was basically "remedial" in nature. However, the classic Eight-Year Study, which began in 1933, was a time of major change. Tyler (1971) recalled that this period was one of unusual excitement, as teachers in a select group of thirty schools made the transition from "remedial" to "creative in-service education." This era also gave rise to the popular "workshop" format used so extensively for in-service projects.

Unfortunately, the results of the Eight-Year Study were published in 1942, when the world was engulfed in World War II. The Second World War brought in its wake a very severe teacher shortage, and in-service education and staff development became remedial once

SP035639

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Kershaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

again, as thousands of "teachers" were certified under emergency certificates to staff the nation's classrooms. The period after World War II (1945-1960) witnessed subtle changes in inservice education: the programs became oriented toward personal and curriculum development rather than simple remediation.

Implementation of new programs often involved developing different skills, techniques, and roles. New programs affected the continuing education of teachers significantly, but the impact of rapid change in society more vividly impinges on in-service education.

In addition, there were at least ten movements and trends that required renewed and massive local initiatives for staff development:

1. Focus on the effective schools movement;
2. School-based staff development;
3. Locally negotiated agreements relating to in-service education;
4. Increased state requirements for renewal of teaching credentials;
5. Restructuring of the concept of the middle school;
6. Renewed emphasis on instructional processes;
7. Growth of professional organizations such as the National Staff Development Council, which focus on in-service issues;
8. Emergence of the microcomputer as an instructional tool;
9. National debates about teacher preparatory programs;
10. Tendency to use staff development as a means of enhancing teacher compensation.

Collectively, these issues were created staff development as an emergent cause that would definitely reach new heights in the last decade of the twentieth century. Teachers needed to know what was done in the past and why. The history of educational practices and instructional technologies showed a continuous evolution of ideas, while trends forecast pending changes. The vision and historical understanding were implicit in the way in-service education was defined and delivered. Let us examine that point.

There were various terms used to describe the concept of in-service education. According to Greene (1971), the term "in-service education" was commonly used to denote planned efforts to promote the professional growth and development of school personnel. "In-service education" and "in-service training" were often used interchangeably, but differences did exist between them, of which Glaser (1971) cited two: specificity of the behavioral end products and minimizing versus maximizing individual differences.

Training implied greater specificity (e.g., helping teachers learn how to demonstrate to pupils in the first grade which materials a magnet attracts) and greater uniformity of behavior (e.g., teaching teachers how to line up pupils in the classroom). Education implied creating end products that were not highly specified (e.g., helping teachers learn to try out alternate ways of teaching about magnets) and maximizing individual differences (e.g., helping teachers to work most effectively by using their own styles of teaching). The concept of in-service education implied greater sharing by the personnel involved in the planning and development of the program than did in-service training. Obviously, many professional growth-and-development programs included aspects of training and education. In-service education was, more than anything else, directed toward and concerned with the functioning of the individual--the teacher, principal, supervisor and others--in contrast with concern that was focused upon the curriculum, materials, or organization. It was based on the assumption that the human being was the key element in the educational process. (1971, p. 263)

The definitions found throughout the available literature did have common elements. For the purposes of this paper, in-service education will be defined as programs or activities that were based on identified needs and a very specific set of learning objectives and activities that were designed to improve skills. All educational planners needed a vision---a rationale---to increase the effectiveness of the services offered in order to enhance the human potential of their organization.

Lambert's (1989) criticisms of direct instruction for students and teachers implied that some mysterious but undefined alternative was superior. Basically we got a rehash of the tired argument about whether teaching was an art or a science. Thinking educators knew this was a base dichotomy; teaching had both artistic and scientific aspects. No single final answer was available to the question of how best to teach--to meet all the different stages of development, degrees of knowledge, levels of motivation, and varying spheres of interest that existed in a typical classroom of 30 students. But many of the researchers cavalierly dismissed by Lambert have begun to make modest inroads into the puzzling interactions of the teaching/learning enterprise. They have shown, for instance, that effective instruction was neither lockstep adherence to a sterile direct instructional approach nor faith in ill-defined and unstructured practices, but rather the selection and use of a repertoire of appropriate strategies by a skilled teacher.

Lambert's alternative to current staff development effort was a collection of loosely defined ideas couched in "warm tone" words like empowerment. But she provided no supporting evidence that those "superior" efforts would have improved instruction or enhanced student achievement and attitudes.

According to Moffett (1989), the function of professional development activities was twofold: to enhance professional knowledge and skills through training and to promote a culture of dialogue that supports experimentation and reflection on practice. Recognizing the importance of the knowledge that teachers construct from classroom experience was critical. However, much depended on the context---time, urgency, and existing skill levels (Brandt 1989)---on participants' levels of cognitive and career development, and on the degree to which they were committed to their own professional growth and improvement. In examining the issues Lambert raised, it was useful to distinguish among:

1. the use of direct instruction in staff development sessions where the concepts and skills were new to the learners;
2. the use of a repertoire of eliciting, interactive, and experiential training strategies in situations where the content was an extension of the learners' present knowledge and skill;
3. the appropriate use of prescriptive feedback (advice and suggestions) and nonprescriptive feedback (encouraging reflective analysis and critical inquiry) in coaching, supervision, and instructional problem solving.

One of the most exciting aspects of professional development was the growing repertoire of training and supervisory strategies staff developers commanded. Lambert was correct: we were at the end of an era in staff development. But there was a continuum operating here, one that included our growing knowledge of research, of best practice in staff development, and of appropriate organizational structures for schools.

Dillion-Peterson (1981), stated that schools have been strong enough to absorb new personnel in vast numbers and withstood enormous social upheaval. What had resulted, however, was a profession that was exceedingly troubled at present.

If the education profession was to flourish and if schools were to be a vital force in society, it would be necessary to rebuild the school into a lifelong learning laboratory not only for children but for teachers as well. The improvement of staff development was not a matter of deciding how to create and implement ad hoc programs. Rather, it was a matter of generating a rich environment in which every education professional became a student of education and worked continuously to improve his or her skills. If schools were not being improved, they atrophy. Teaching was an experiment in life and, like a marriage, it must be worked on or it would become desperately routine. The environment of the school must regenerate the relationships between teachers, learners, and community members or the school would lose its vitality.

Making schools into learning laboratories would be a long, slow process, but its time for them to make the commitment and to put forth energies in that process and not to waste them by repeating the mistakes of the past.

Haskvitz (1990) stated that a new inservice motivated by the importance of having a happy staff was more likely to react positively to change---the same message professional business promotional experts have successfully utilized for years. This new inservice was called, re-excitement, and was simply taken from Maslow's self-actualization process of producing people who felt good about themselves. Seeing a reward---self interest, motivated the teacher and the result was a more favorable climate and greater receptivity.

Westbrook and Tipping (1992) stated that the S.O.S. program provided training and ongoing support for designated staff development specialists at each campus. According to Glickman and Calhoun (1991), schools would be improved by "internally controlled, participatory developed, site-based staff development programs linked to school goals" (p.7). Wood (1989) discussed the school as the "primary unit of change" (p.26), and the effective schools research revealed that the individual school made the difference when student achievement was the focus of school improvement efforts (Goodlad, 1984).

Guskey (1986) suggested that it was imperative for schools to adopt a variety of innovative strategies so that all components of the cycle were addressed. For site-based management to be successful, it was clear that central office staff developers must provide each individual campus with support, expertise, and options for the development and delivery of their own staff development.

Sparks (1992) stated that significant school improvement efforts were closely linked to qualify staff development programs, and that elementary school principals must have appropriate staff development knowledge and skills if they were to help move their schools forward to meet the complex educational challenges of the 1990s and beyond.

Tyler's (1990) key component of any effective staff development program was a district staff development steering committee. He stated that staff development activities should be well-planned and flexible to assure their success, smaller group activities should also be planned to reflect district and school level goals, and should be responsive to the perceived needs of staff with a hands-on approach. Total group participation should be conducted once or twice each year. These activities were the key component to change.

Brimm and Tollett (1974) conducted a statewide research study in

Tennessee that yielded information concerning the teachers opinions of inservice education. They received 646 usable questionnaires which constituted about 65% of the sample. The item that received the strongest endorsement by the teachers was concerned with the teachers ability to have some involvement in the selection of the kind of inservice activities which they felt would strengthen their professional competence. Teachers also were seen as preferring to have inservice programs conducted within their own school setting. Teachers strongly agreed that one of the primary purposes of inservice should be to help the teacher become more effective in the classroom. Unfortunately, many teachers in the survey felt that inservice activities were not relevant to the needs of the teacher. A great deal of teachers thought that their inservice programs were not well-planned, and that they did not specify what objectives were being addressed. More than half of the teachers agreed with the statement that, "Most teachers do not like to attend inservice activities."

Purvis and Boren (1991) stated that since the drafting of the Mississippi Education Reform Act of 1982, staff development had been a topic of great interest and focus in Mississippi. After examining the reform acts of other states, it was evident that there was a nationwide effort to improve staff development programs for teachers, administrators, and other personnel. Specifically, this meant creating staff development programs that were relevant to the needs of the school administration, the district, the teachers, and other school employees. This showed that a variety of general guidelines for designing staff development programs were in existence throughout the United States.

There were five common phases of staff development:

1. preplanning,
2. planning,
3. implementation,
4. evaluation,
5. maintenance.

<u>The Preplanning Stage:</u>

Before planning staff development programs, the principal should establish a steering committee composed of teachers and administrators. Counselors, librarians, teacher assistants, and the PTA/TPO president may also serve as committee members. The first responsibility of the committee is to conduct a thorough needs assessment, including teachers' needs---both for global and for specific groups of teachers, individual schools' needs, the districts' needs, and the students' needs. The steering committee must obtain topics for staff development programs by soliciting input from all members of the faculty.

The Planning Stage:

This stage involved the details of preparation, including setting goals and objectives for the program, deciding who would lead the staff development activities, designating when and where the sessions will be held, deciding how the program would be evaluated, and designing a method for rewarding participants for attending.

The Implementation Stage:

Several other factors must be considered when planning a staff development program. First, the environment should be such that participants feel free to contribute and to ask questions. Second, the information should be presented in a clear and understandable manner. Finally, the participants should be given time to practice new techniques and receive feedback on their performance during the program.

The Evaluation Stage:

Following the workshop, the staff development steering committee should review written and verbal evaluation material and determine whether or not the program achieved its goals. Suggestions for future programs should be compiled and kept for future reference. A brief follow-up report should be sent to all teachers and to the principal.

The Maintenance Stage:

The importance of this stage cannot be overemphasized. All too often, teachers attend staff development programs and learn new techniques, but do not use what they have learned on their jobs. Therefore, the staff development committee should periodically provide feedback on whether or not the new techniques were being employed by the teachers who participated in the workshop. Creation of a reward and/or incentive system for those teachers who were using the technique was one possible way to ensure that the new skills were used.

Westbrook and Tipping (1992) stated that the S.O.S. program provided training and ongoing support for designated staff development specialists at each campus. According to Glickman and Calhoun (1991), schools would be improved by "internally controlled, participatory developed, site-based staff development programs linked to school goals" (p.7). Wood (1989) discussed the school as the "primary unit of change" (p.26), and the effective schools research revealed that the individual school made the difference when student achievement was the focus of school improvement efforts (Goodlad, 1984).

Several RISD principals expressed concern over their ability to select and implement appropriate site-based school improvement activities and to involve teachers in that process. The RISD Teacher Cadre was a logical choice to fill this role. Teacher Cadre members were selected on the basis of recommendations from the district administrators, teaching performance, knowledge or interest in a specific topic, and communication skills. They received extensive and ongoing training in presentation skills, in the content or pedagogical topic on which they present, and in effective facilitation of staff development training sessions.

The S.O.S. training program had four objectives:

1. to provide a framework to evaluate commonly adopted instructional innovations and strategies,
2. to recognize the contextual dimensions of staff development,
3. to identify a variety of models od staff development,
4. to identify the stage of RPTIM (described later) at which their school might be functioning.

According to Sparks (1992), there were ten recommended practices of staff and organization development that follow, when appropriately instituted, can have a profound impact on the attitudes and instructional behavior of teachers in your schools.

1. Have a clear vision for your school. A shared vision is a powerful force in shaping staff attitudes and behavior.
2. Establish norms of collegiality and experimentation. Risking new behavior is less threatening in schools where cooperation and experimentation are the norm.
3. Display a collaborative attitude. When it comes to staff development, two heads are better than one.
4. Use research on staff development. Staff development programs will be successful only if they are carefully designed and well implemented according to current research.
5. Recognize that staff development can take many forms.
6. Encourage faculty involvement in a wide range of staff development activities. Allocate discretionary resources at your school to allow teachers to attend workshops and conferences and ask them to share what they have learned at staff meetings.
7. Stay abreast of recent research and practice. While the demands of the principalship are never-ending, a few minutes of reading and planning each day can focus your efforts.
8. View supervision and evaluation as opportunities for growth rather than as remedial activities.
9. Model what you preach. If your would like teachers to be

enthusiastic lifelong learners, it is important to show them that you are one.
10. Take the long view. Lasting change takes time.

Haskvitz (1990) stated that a new inservice motivated by the importance of having a happy staff which is more likely to react positively to change---the same message professional business promotional experts have successful utilized for years. This new inservice was called, re-excitement, and was simply taken from Maslow's self-actualization process of producing people who felt good about themselves. Seeing a reward---self interest, motivated the teacher and the result was a more favorable climate and greater receptivity. Re-excitement staff development practices would provide both the old and new group with ideas, motivation and creativity to enable new concepts the opportunity to flourish and grow. It was time to motivate the team to the new challenges that education was offering.

Tyler (1990) suggested that the key component of any effective staff development program is a district staff development steering committee. This committee had as its members representatives from district and site level administration, teachers from all levels and a classified staff member from every employee unit. This committee's purpose was to identify staff needs by

1. formulating, distributing and compiling an inventory for all employees;
2. to relate these needs to board-approved district goals;
3. to plan and organize inservice sessions based on these identified needs and goals;
4. to survey workshop participants and evaluate the effectiveness of the training.

Staff development activities should be well-planned and flexible to assure their success. Smaller group activities should also be planned to reflect district and school level goals and should be responsive to the perceived needs of staff with a hands-on approach. Total group participation and should be conducted only once or twice each year. These activities were the key component to change.

Guskey (1986) suggested that it was imperative for schools to adopt a variety of innovative strategies so that all components of the cycle were addressed. For site-based management to be successful, it was clear that central office staff developers must provide each individual campus with support, expertise, and options for the development and delivery of their own staff development.

Lipton and Greenblatt (1992) reported on a large southwestern school district that used a coaching project in which 48 of their

teachers formed coaching pairs and attended seven days of staff development training. Upon returning to their schools, they found that there was no time to meet for pre-conferencing and no opportunities for classroom coverage so they could schedule observations. Although the teachers were excited about trying the new ideas and strategies after they completed the workshop, their energy was diffused by the daily demands of their work and there was not support system to bolster their enthusiasm. Fullan (1992) stated that eventhough staff development was increasingly recognized as an important stimulus and support for school renewal, its potential was diluted because it often functions without connection to the organizational and school-site contexts in which it operates. Lipton and Greenblatt felt that without connection to the larger frame of organization development and, more importantly, without a shared vision of desired outcomes against which the program can be evaluate, staff development programs could produce maximum effort with minimum results.

Lambert (1989), stated that we have come to the end of an era. Staff development as we have known it have proven ineffective and limiting. To usher in a new era, we needed a new vision of staff development---one that challenged and involved teachers in the honoring and creation of their own knowledge.

Because we have insisted on "telling" teachers how to improve, the staff development community has had limited influence on the profession. Instead of persisting in this error, we should have encouraged teachers to do what they have not done:

1. talk about their own thinking and teaching, instead of just about materials, discipline, activities, and individualization for students;
2. initiate change in the school environment;
3. contribute to the knowledge base of the profession;
4. enculturate new teachers in the positive-practice and self-directing norms of teaching;
5. share in the leadership of schools;
6. foster teachers' union commitment to improving the profession, especially at the local level;
7. help to design the restructuring of schooling;
8. design new or expanded roles for themselves;
9. actively and cooperatively improved the societal image of teaching as a profession.

When teachers engaged in reflective practice, collegiality, and shared leadership, they began to understand themselves and their work differently. This new understanding caused a shift in their beliefs and norms. This shift, in turn, created new opportunities, new visions of what could be done. The new professional development was a cultural, not a delivery, concept.

Blackburn (1989) stated that staff development was not something

that could be applauded or condemned out of hand; it was a service function within an organization. As such, it was likely to be as effective as the organization was healthy. Obviously, any effort to improve skills and increase knowledge could range from very effective to disastrous depending on organizational realities, topics, the efficacy of trainers, and other situational conditions.

The conclusion of this research was done to pull together the elements of these findings. The paragraphs below will attempt to consolidate the information presented in this review.

Moffett (1989) felt the function of professional development activities is twofold: to enhance professional knowledge and skills through training and to promote a culture of dialogue that supports experimentation and reflection on practice. While Dillion-Peterson (1981) felt that in order for the education profession to flourish, it was necessary to rebuild the school into a lifelong learning laboratory not only for children but for teachers as well. The improvement of staff development was not a matter of deciding how to create and implement ad hoc programs. Rather, it was a matter of generating a rich environment in which every professional became a student of education and worked continuously to improve his or her skills.

Haskvitz (1990) went with the reconstruction of the inservice plan. He came up with a new inservice called re-excitement which he took from Maslow's self-actualization hierarchy. He felt that in order to have happy teachers, the school must provide teachers with the necessary incentives to motivate them.

Guskey (1986) suggested that it was imperative for schools to adopt a variety of innovative strategies so that all components of the cycle were addressed. According to Sparks (1992) the significant school improvement efforts were closely linked to the knowledge and skills of school principals. Tyler (1990) said the key component of any effective staff development program was a district staff development steering committee.

On the other side of the spectrum, Lambert (1989) stated that we have come to the end of an era. Staff development as we have known it had proven ineffective and limiting due to the one-shot inspirational speakers or an occasional conference in subject matter---fell far short of addressing our needs for systematic learning about teaching. Blackburn (1989) agreed with Lambert when he stated that staff development was not something that can be applauded or condemned out of hand, because any effort to improve skills and increase knowledge could range from very effective to disastrous depending on organizational realities, topics, the efficacy of trainers, and other situational conditions.

School improvement was really people improvement. If they would view staff development as one of their most important responsibilities, they would have a profound influence on the direction their school would take in order to meet the challenges of educating students for the 21st century.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine what are teachers assessment of the agenda and the organization of staff development programs as suggested in current research?

Procedures

The population for this study included 38 Chicago Public School teachers 63% female and 37% male. An available sample of thirty-six classroom teachers were selected.

Purvis and Boren (1991) developed the Survey for the "Southern Education Consortium (SEC, 1988)." It was revised by the researcher to measure teachers' assessment of the agenda and the organization of staff development programs in accordance with current research. The revised survey was retitled Kershaw's Staff Development Assessment Survey (KSDAS).

The thirty item Kershaw's Staff Development Assessment Survey (KSDAS) was distributed to sample in the school district. They were asked to respond does not need consideration this year, consideration should be given this year, or needs immediate attention this year for the first seven statements and yes, no, or don't know for the remaining twenty-three statements. The researcher then collected the completed surveys.

The survey included six categories.

1. Topics
2. Preplanning
3. Planning
4. Implementation
5. Evaluation
6. Maintenance

There was a total of thirty statements. The first category contained seven statements, the second category contained five statements, the third category contained six statements, the fourth category contained eight statements, the fifth category contained three statements, and the sixth category contained one statement. The respondents were requested to indicate their gender.

The findings were tabulated in terms of percentages and the chi square test was employed at the .05 level of confidence to

determine the statistical significance of the findings. Table 1 shows the raw scores and percentages and the summarized statistical analyses. Responses to the 30 item survey are in Table 1. The responses of the genders were not reported here because there was no significant difference in their answers.

Findings

The data in the Table 1, shows most teachers felt consideration should have been given to all the topics on staff development meetings. The areas that teachers significantly (.05) felt required the most immediate attention dealt with student discipline, parental participation, at-risk students, and classroom behavior management. The statistical data on student-centered topics showed that significant (.05) extraneous variables beyond the schools control such as socioeconomic status, peer pressure, neighborhood and family structure have had a tremendous impact on the students.

In regards to preplanning/establishing a committee, forty percent significantly (.05) felt their major concerns were not recognized. Thirty-seven percent (significant .05) stated they had not established a staff development committee and more than ten percent significant did not even know if they had a committee which preplanned inservice training. More than thirty-seven percent (significant .05) felt their needs and interests were not specifically stated. The response to question twelve, showed that one hundred percent significant at (.05) felt the format of the staff development programs should allow for teachers' input and evaluation. This was the only question that teachers responded yes to unanimously.

In regards to planning staff development, sixty-three percent (.05) felt they had no input in planning the staff development meeting. Current research validated this claim that in order to have successful staff development meetings, teachers must totally be involved in the planning process. Forty-seven percent (.05) stated that goals and objectives had been set and written clearly and appropriate leaders for staff development meetings have been selected and contacted, but no to a system for evaluating the meeting. This was the only section that teachers responded high--in the no and don't know categories. The response to question thirteen, showed that more than seventy-five percent significant at (.05) of the administrators employ top-down communication.

Eight questions were asked on the implementation of staff development meetings. Seventy-five percent (.05) felt the environment was flexible for small and large group activities, agendas was handed out, the leader was introduced and welcomed,

TABLE 1
RESPONSES TO TOPICS ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Does not need consideration this year.
2. Consideration should be given this year.
3. Needs immediate attention this year.

	N=30		
	[1]	[2]	[3]
Topic:			
1. Student Discipline	3	6	21
	10%	20%	70%
2. Parental Participation	3	9	18
	10%	30%	60%
3. At-Risk Students	4	6	20
	13%	20%	67%
4. Climate/Morale	3	16	11
	10%	53%*	37%
5. Teacher Collegiality	7	17	6
	23%	57%*	20%
6. Teachers' Participation in Decision Making	4	15	11
	13%	50%	37%
7. Classroom Behavior Management for the 90's	3	11	16
	10%	37%	53%

[1] YES [2] NO [3] DON'T KNOW

Preplanning:			
8. The school has established a staff development committee to choose staff development training for the site.	15	11	4
	50%	37%	13%
9. The staff development committee is comprised of teachers and administrators.	18	8	4
	60%*	27%	13%
10. The needs and interests of the teachers' are specifically stated.	14	11	5
	47%	37%	17%
11. The major concerns of the teachers are recognized.	15	12	3
	50%	40%	10%
12. The format of staff development programs should allow for teachers' input and evaluation.	30	0	0
	100%*	0%	0%
Planning:			
13. Teachers' not on the committee are involved in all aspects of planning the staff development training.	9	19	4
	30%	63%*	13%
14. Goals and objectives have been set and written clearly.	14	10	6
	47%	33%	20%
15. Appropriate leaders for staff development sessions have been selected and contacted.	14	7	9
	47%	23%	30%
16. Committee members have been appointed to meet with the staff development leader before the training to see of any provisions needs to be made.	8	10	12
	27%	33%	40%
17. A system for evaluating the training has been made.	11	14	5
	37%	47%	17%
18. An attempt has been made to inform the staff development leader of all the needs, and concerns of the teachers.	12	9	9
	40%	30%	30%
Implementation:			
19. There are ample opportunities for active involvement and practice of techniques by participants.	16	10	4
	53%	33%	13%
20. New techniques or skills are introduced.	19	7	4
	63%*	23%	13%
21. Environment is comfortable.	22	4	4
	73%*	13%	13%
22. Meeting facility is flexible for both small and large-group activities.	21	7	2
	70%*	23%	7%
23. Written goals and objectives are handed out and discussed.	16	11	3
	53%	37%	10%
24. An agenda for the day is handed out.	21	8	1
	70%*	27%	3%
25. Leader is welcomed and introduced.	25	4	3
	83%*	13%	10%
26. Participates have an opportunity to ask questions.	24	5	1
	80%*	17%	3%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation:			
27. Time is allowed for discussion on the topic.	22 73%*	7 23%	1 3%
28. Teachers have the opportunity to evaluate the presentation.	22 73%*	6 20%	2 7%
29. Follow-up sessions within the school are made to discuss success and/or failure of implementation or evaluation.	12 40%	13 43%	5 17%
Maintenance:			
30. Incentives for employing these new techniques are provided.	9 30%	14 47%	7 23%

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and an opportunity was given to ask questions. Fifty-three percent significant (.05) stated there was ample opportunities for active involvement and practice of techniques by participants, and written goals and objectives were handed out and discussed.

In regards to evaluation of staff development, seventy-three percent (.05) felt time was allocated for discussion and evaluating the presentation. Twenty percent (.05) felt they did not have enough time for discussions on topics or an opportunity to evaluate the presentation. The follow-up section was not so positive. Only forty percent significant (.05) felt time was allocated to discuss the successes/failures of the meetings. Current research stated one main problem with staff development was the lack of follow up support systems and funding, time constraints, and administrative backing.

In regards to maintenance of staff development, thirty percent significant (.05) felt incentives were given for employing new techniques, forty percent significant (.05) felt incentives were not given for employing new techniques, and twenty-three percent significant (.05) did not know whether or not there administrator and/or district gave incentives for employing new techniques.

In summary, teachers agree with the research findings concerning staff development programs. They agree that teachers should take a more active role in preplanning, planning and implementing their own staff development programs. They agree that their professional needs, interests, and concerns should be addressed within a school-based program. Also, they agree that the staff development leader needs to be aware of their needs and concerns. Since teachers agree with all the things suggested in the current research on staff development programs, pressure should be placed on those areas of major concern such as preplanning, planning, and maintenance in order to utilize these findings to make staff development programs more beneficial and powerful for teachers. Staff development programs need to be restructured to reflect these findings, in order to utilize teachers time and educational skills more efficiently.

Bibliography

Blackburn, Guy. Staff Development Is Alive and Well. Educational Leadership, September 1989, 47, 1, 83.

Brimm, J. L. and Tollett, D. J. "How do teachers feel about in-service education?" Educational Administration, (March 1974).

Dillion-Peterson, Betty. Staff Development/Organization Development. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Greene, Jay E. School Personnel Administration. Pennsylvania: Chilton Book Company, 1971.

Guskey, Thomas R. Staff Development and the Process of TEacher Change. Educational Researcher (May 1986)

Harris, Ben M. Improving Staff Performance Through In-Service Education. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Haskvitz, Alan. Re-excitement Inservices: Motivating Teachers To Change. Thrust for Educational Leadership, February/March 1990, 19, 18-20.

Lambert, Linda. The End of an Era of Staff Development. Educational Leadership, September 1989, 47, 1, 78-81.

Lipton, Laura and Greenblatt, Ruth. Supporting the Learning Organization: A Model for Congruent System-Wide Renewal. Journal of Staff Development, Summer 1992, 13, 3, 20-25.

Moffett, Cerylle. How Do We Get There from Here? Educational Leadership, September 1989, 47, 1, 82.

Orlich, Donald C. Staff Development: Enhancing Human Potential. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1989.

Purvis, Johnny R., and Boren, Lisa C. Planning, Implementing, A Staff Development Program. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, September 1991, 75, 16-23.

Sparks, Dennis. The Keys to Effective Staff Development. Phi Delta Kappan, January 1992, 71, 36-38.

Tyler, Clifford. Components To Consider For Your District's Staff Development Needs. Thrust for Educational Leadership, February/March 1990, 19, 21-23.

Westbrook, Jody M. and Tipping, Sharon R. Improved Site-Based Staff Development Through the S.O.S. Program. Journal of Staff Development, Fall 1992, 13, 4, 34-36.